

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated June 23, 2005, a final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 9-14 in the Office Action Summary, wherein the Examiner also objected to claims 7, 8, 15 and 16; however, in the text of the rejection, the Examiner further rejected claims 7 and 15.

Responsive to the grounds for the Examiner's rejection, Applicants are amending claims 8 and 16 to be in independent form; the Examiner has indicated that these claims would then be held allowable. Applicants are also amending claims 7 and 15 to be in independent form including all restrictions of claim 1 from which these claims are dependent and, further, including clarification to clearly distinguish the subject matter of these claims from the cited prior art. Applicants respectfully submit that as amended these claims should be held allowable.

As stated by the Examiner, the basic subject matter of Fang differs from that of Applicant:

Fang discloses customer premises equipment that support multiple control languages for multiple call agents.

The cited limitations which the Examiner indicated have been anticipated by Fang and as modified by Applicants' amendment are:

1. disconnecting said CPE from said packet network
2. reconnecting said CPE to said packet network at a different port and a different switch [underlines indicate additions in this amendment]; and
3. recording in said packet network an identity of said different port and different switch for completing calls to and from said CPE at said different port.

Applicants respectfully submit that Fang does not disclose the last clause. The Examiner stated:

In Fang the memory 192 (not shown but located in the call agents 108 and 109 - Fig. 1 see page 2 - 0020) inherently stores the ports or connections from which the call agents 108 and 109 Fig. 2 are able to provide for the telephone communications over VoIP system see page 2 - 0022.

Note that as implied initially, and as now fully clarified, the identity of the different port is stored in the packet network, not in the CPE. This distinction is not simply a quibble but is important because it means that for incoming calls the calls the network has the intelligence to route the incoming call to the switch serving the CPE and need not route it to the switch whose identity was originally recorded in the packet network.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of claim 7 as herein amended and claim 15, a corresponding apparatus claim as herein amended, should be held allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the grounds for rejection of claims 7 and 15 as herein amended, allow these claims and claims 8 and 16 previously held allowable if restated in independent form and pass the application to issue.

If the Examiner feels that a voice or fax contact would help to advance the prosecution of this application, he is invited to contact Applicants' attorney at telephone number 630 469-3575.

Respectfully submitted

C. W. Coffey et al.



by Werner Ulrich
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 30810

Date: Sept. 18, 2005

P.S.
Amendment being resubmitted because earlier submission failed to include a \$200 fee for extra independent claim. The fee is being submitted herewith.

W. Ulrich
9/18/05